

REMARKS

In the Office Action issued on May 5, 2006, claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,420,993 to Varon. Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Varon in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,408,404 to Ladwig. Claims 10-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Ladwig in view of Varon.

Claims 1-16 are now pending in this application. Claims 1, 10, 11, 14, and 15 were amended to clarify the subject matter that the applicant considers to be the invention..

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention according to 1-8 are not unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,420,993 to Varon. Varon discloses a technique for predicting conflict between maneuvering aircrafts. The system receives input providing various types of information. The system generates alerts to indicate that one or more targets are physically closer than allowed using the information received.

In contrast, the present invention predict whether an alert should be issued by determining if execution of the instructions complies with the users' intent based, in part, on a comparison of the restructured messages with stored reference information. Varon fails to teach or suggest this limitation. Accordingly, claim 1 of the present invention is not unpatentable over Varon.

Claims 2-8 depend from claim 1 and thus are not unpatentable over Varon for at least the reasons discussed with respect to claim 1.

The Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention according to 9 is not unpatentable over Varon in view of Ladwig.

Ladwig does not cure the deficiencies of Varon. Ladwig teaches a system that accepts data streams and the data streams are sorted using rules base. Ladwig fails to disclose determining if execution of the instructions complies with the users' intent based, in part, on a comparison of the restructured messages with stored reference information. Accordingly, claim 9 of the present invention is not unpatentable over Varon.

Claims 10 and 15 recite similar limitation to claim 1, as well as claims 11-14 which depend from claim 10, and thus are not taught or suggested for at least the reasons discussed with respect to claim 1.


Additional Fees:

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with this application to Deposit Account No. 19-5127 (25389.0009).

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, all of the Examiner's rejections to the claims are believed to be overcome. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and issuance of a Notice of Allowance for all the claims remaining in the application. Should the Examiner feel further communication would facilitate prosecution, he is urged to call the undersigned at the phone number provided below.

Date: November 6, 2006



Chadwick A. Jackson, Reg. No. 46,495
Attorney for Applicants
Bingham McCutchen LLP
3000 K Street, NW, Suite 300
Washington, DC 20007
Telephone: (202) 339-8951